

E480

.S84



GOVERNMENT CONTRACTS.

E 480  
.S84  
Copy 1

SPEECH

OF

HON. THAD. STEVENS,

OF PENNSYLVANIA,

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

APRIL 23, 1862,

On the Report of the Select Committee on Government Contracts.

—O—

WASHINGTON, D. C.

JAMMELL & CO., PRINTERS, COR. SECOND & IND. AVENUE, THIRD FLOOR.  
1862.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BLANKET

BLANKET

BLANKET

BLANKET

BLANKET

BLANKET

BLANKET

## SPEECH.

Mr. STEVENS said:

If I were not impelled by a sense of duty to defend gentlemen who have been calumniated in this report and upon this floor, yet I am sure it would be expected of me to make some reply to the remarks of the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. DAWES,] and that he would feel that he was treated with neglect if I wholly omitted that duty. [Laughter.] I shall, therefore, I trust, in a spirit of calmness, and certainly without any further personalities than are unavoidable in the discussion of this report, proceed to make a few remarks. I shall argue this question *in rem* and not *in personam*, any further than the person sticks to the thing. And certainly no member of the committee will be brought in question in the remarks I shall make, except the honorable member from Massachusetts, [Mr. DAWES,] for no other member has said anything which can be considered as personal or unkind.

The gentleman from Massachusetts on Friday last announced to the House that he had notified me that he was about to proceed to call up these resolutions, but that I had deemed it proper to be absent on that occasion notwithstanding that notice. I had expected from the candor of the gentleman from Massachusetts one further remark, which I am sure he omitted through mere forgetfulness, which was that I was about leaving the House when he informed me that he would call up this matter, and that I told him that I had an appointment which I could not forego with strangers about to leave the city, but that I supposed I should have an opportunity of seeing his remarks in the papers, unless he should think proper to postpone the discussion of the subject until Monday. If he determined, however, to call up the subject, and proceed with the discussion, I hoped he would mention the circumstances to the House. The gentleman from Massachusetts did not mention the latter fact, and I was indebted to my friend from Indiana

[Mr. COLFAX] for bringing that information to the attention of the House, so that no harm was done. I merely mention the circumstance. I make no complaint at all.

The gentleman from Massachusetts further complains that while all the members of his committee were absent—I have no doubt very usefully and properly employed, some of them wandering about in New York, some in Pennsylvania, some in Ohio, and others to the four quarters of the globe, tracking these rogues that they have been pursuing with such commendable industry—some remarks were made in this House reflecting upon the integrity of their report.

Now, Mr. Speaker, you know, and the House know, that the discussion which took place on that occasion was not voluntary on the part of those who rose to defend the characters of persons assailed in that report. The learned gentleman from New York [Mr. DIVEN] introduced a resolution, which I do not say was called up on that day on his motion. I do not recollect how it came up. Upon that resolution he made a speech, able, eloquent, somewhat bitter, against the gentlemen who were named in his resolution, which sought the direction of this House to proceed to recover money illegally retained, as was alleged, by Major General Fremont and Mr. Beard. And he founded his authority and justification for such an extraordinary proceeding, with which, in my humble judgment, we had nothing more to do than we have with these resolutions, for they are all beyond the jurisdiction of the House—he founded his resolution upon what he called the condemnation of these men by the report of this committee.

Now, it would have been possible for those who were disposed to see justice done by this House to do one of two things: either to sit quietly by and suffer this charge to go forth as true, or to impeach the testimony upon which the gentleman from New York founded it. We

pursued the latter course. It is true that when the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. THOMAS] called our attention to the fact that the committee were not here, we might have stopped at once and allowed the House to condemn the other gentlemen who were never here, without a hearing. That would have been, I suppose, what the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. DAWES] would call "even-handed justice;" that is, even-handed *à la mode* the report of this committee. [Laughter.]

But, sir, passing over that, the gentleman complained that those who defended the gentleman against the charges of this report, charged that the report itself contained fraudulent representations, false representations, injurious, calumnious representations against several parties.

Well, sir, it shall be my humble task here to prove every one of these charges, not by invoking facts that have not been brought before the House, not by giving my version of testimony which may be locked up in my breast, not by quoting what may have been reported in the newspapers, but I shall attempt to prove them by what would be legitimate legal evidence before any jury in any court of justice in the land. If I fail in that, I will not attempt to support my position by other means.

Preliminary to that, however, I will say that I think I have a right to complain that this committee have not conducted their investigations in a manner which I call fair. That is to say, when they proceeded to investigate the frauds of any gentleman connected with the Government or not connected with it, they gave such person no notice of it, they furnished him with no copy of the evidence supposed to implicate him, and they afforded him no opportunity to call witnesses to explain the testimony against him or to recall the witnesses whose testimony, as is alleged, goes to impeach his conduct.

Mr. FENTON. I cannot say what the practice of the committee may have been in Ohio or on the Mississippi, where they have held their sessions; but so far as I know, the practice pursued by them in New York, in Harrisburg, and in this city, at the sessions of the committee when I have been present, the practice which the gentleman condemns has not been pursued by the committee. I cannot call to mind one instance where the committee have failed to serve upon the party accused a copy of the testimony bearing upon him, or have not afforded him ample opportunity for personal explanation. Beyond the sessions of the committee in the places I have named, I have no information other than that in the possession of every member of the House.

Mr. WASHBURNE. That has been the general practice of the committee everywhere.

Mr. STEVENS. Yes sir. The documents, however, do not show it, and I am sure the sworn testimony will not show it. I know that

in New York application was several times made to have witnesses subpoenaed, and yet the committee never issued such subpoenas. I am quite sure that such was the fact in reference to General Fremont. At least I believe it to be so. I think it was so in regard to Mr. Cummings; and in no case, so far as I recollect, does the journal of the committee show that they pursued that course.

Mr. DAWES. What does the gentleman say in reference to Mr. Cummings?

Mr. STEVENS. I spoke of a single instance when it was desired that Mr. Blatchford should be subpoenaed; but he was not subpoenaed.

Mr. DAWES. That was sufficiently set forth in the debate the other day, and I supposed everybody understood it; but of course the gentleman from Pennsylvania did not.

Mr. STEVENS. Did the gentleman issue a subpoena for Mr. Blatchford?

Mr. DAWES. I suppose the gentleman does not refer to me individually.

Mr. STEVENS. I mean the committee.

Mr. DAWES. Certainly they did.

Mr. STEVENS. But was that before the report was filed?

Mr. DAWES. We gave the invitation before the report was filed.

Mr. STEVENS. Ah!

Mr. DAWES. The gentleman knows that before the report was made an appointment was made to meet Mr. Blatchford; but when he did not appear, the committee then had a subpoena issued to compel his appearance. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. STEVENS. I did not know it.

Mr. DAWES. I perceive that the gentleman does not know it.

Mr. WASHBURNE. I say that General Fremont had notice given to him.

Mr. DAWES. If the gentleman from Pennsylvania will yield to me right here I will state that Mr. Simon Stevens, a gentleman who feels aggrieved by one of the resolutions, called upon the committee, and the committee told him to go to General Fremont and inquire of him when it would be most agreeable for him to appear before the committee. They wanted him to fix his own time, and the committee would accommodate him.

Mr. STEVENS. I suppose he would have answered a subpoena. But the journal of the committee shows precisely what I have stated—that no notice was given and no testimony furnished to the accused. I find in the journals of a former select committee on naval contracts that they not only gave the party implicated notice, but a copy of the testimony implicating him. I see in the *Globe* that Mr. Wade, a Senator from Ohio, and chairman of another select committee, made this declaration:

"We sought no evidence to impeach any man, and if the evidence seemed to impinge on the

'credibility, the loyalty, or the character of any man, we sought that man, and laid before him the course of the evidence, and the matters wherein he was inculcated.'

A worthy and just example, which I regret extremely that this committee, which has so large an influence upon the public mind, has not followed, and given notice in the case I have referred to. I know, sir, that the Spanish inquisition may be cited on the other side. They did business just as this committee have done it. But as worthier examples for imitation, I would have preferred those of Senator WADE and the committee on naval contracts. But all of this is incidental.

I do not object to these interruptions; but as they occupy my time, I hope that the House will not object to my continuing beyond my hour, if necessary, in order to finish my remarks.

Now, sir, I have said that there were fraudulent reports. I will have to take a single instance, because I shall not have an opportunity to refer to more than half of this book; [laughter;] and these gentlemen, they say, have something in reserve which they will make public at another time. I am led to believe from the mysterious hints which have fallen from the gentleman from Massachusetts that they have enough behind to answer for all that it is necessary to kill. They can, no doubt, very easily fill their quivers with arrows of the sort they have already shot at the characters of others.

I will give one or two examples. They undertake to censure the Secretary of War for his appointment of Governor Morgan and Alexander Cummings, at the time we were blockaded here, to forward men and supplies to the Government here. There is nothing brought against the character of the men here. They stand before the world unimpeached and unimpeachable so far as the case in controversy is concerned: It was necessary in order to implicate the Secretary of War that something should be made out of the impropriety and fraud of any of his appointees.

I will mention, in this connection, that until my personal relation toward the Secretary of War became the topic of discussion and denunciation by the gentleman from Massachusetts, I never mentioned the name of General Cameron. Heretofore, I have never mentioned his name in connection with this report. I did speak of the transaction of Alexander Cummings, but not of the Secretary of War.

Let us see whether General Cameron is to be censured for appointing Mr. Cummings. That is the only ground of censure. The committee may have in their reserve magazine other grounds which they are not now willing to publish to us. If this does not kill, they are to bring out other weapons. They charge Mr. Cummings, who was appointed to purchase supplies and forward them, in connection with

Governor Morgan, with receiving and not accounting for \$140,000 of the public money. I say that that is a false charge. I did not understand the committee exactly confirmed that fact; but we have in this report elaborately—well, not elaborately, for they could not devote too much time to one victim, they had so many to skin, [laughter]—but we have most distinctly the charge that Mr. Cummings had \$140,000 more in his possession than he testified to in his testimony, and that he has not accounted for it. I say that the testimony does not show that he has one dollar of the kind. I said before, in answer to the gentleman from Massachusetts, who said that he might have settled it with the War Department, that he knew he could not have settled it there.

Mr. DAWES. I do not see my colleague on the committee here.

Mr. STEVENS. Yes; the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. HOLMAN] is right in front of me.

Mr. DAWES. My colleague can inform the House that those vouchers are still unsettled before the Department, although the gentleman got somewhat angry because I would not admit that they were settled.

Mr. STEVENS. The gentleman did not profess anything.

Mr. DAWES. The gentleman seemed to know, because he positively asserted that they were unsettled.

Mr. STEVENS. I asked the gentleman if he did not know they were. My colleague states that the accounts have been settled.

Mr. KELLEY. I have information that the members of the committee have been misinformed on this subject, and that every dollar of these accounts has been settled.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the gentleman permit me?

Mr. STEVENS. The gentleman will follow me.

Mr. HOLMAN. I want to say a word right here. An issue of fact is made whether these accounts are settled.

Mr. STEVENS. Whether his vouchers are filed and settled.

Mr. HOLMAN. I ask the Clerk to read the letter which I send to his desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,  
THIRD AUDITOR'S OFFICE, April 28, 1862.

SIR: In reply to your letter of this date, in which you inquire, in behalf of the Government contract committee, "in what manner the accounts of Alexander Cummings, Esq., agent for the War Department in the months of April and May, 1861, have been settled," I have the honor to inform you that such accounts, with receipts and vouchers pertaining thereto, are on file in this office, but have not yet been settled.

Very respectfully, your obedient servant,

R. J. ATKINSON,

HON. W. S. HOLMAN,

House of Representatives.

Auditor.

Mr. KELLEY. This gentleman undoubtedly has a receipt in full through Mr. Cisco, and a draft for the balance on hand.

Mr. HOLMAN. Who executed the receipt? I undertake to say that the accounts have not been settled; that they have never passed through any department of the Government.

Mr. STEVENS. I understand that he has filed his vouchers for every dollar.

Mr. HOLMAN. I want an answer to my question.

Mr. KELLEY. I will answer it by saying that I am not as skilled in mousing as some of the gentlemen of this committee, and have not examined the copy of the receipt, but it is a receipt from the proper officer of the Government. It is a full receipt, and such as would be satisfactory in any court.

Mr. HOLMAN. Will the gentleman state the name of the officer?

Mr. KELLEY. I tell the gentleman I am not sufficiently skilled in the practice of mousing to be able to give him the information he asks.

Mr. HOLMAN. Does the gentleman know who signed the receipt?

Mr. STEVENS. This cross firing is a little annoying to me just now. I believe, from the information obtained from the Treasury Department, that the matter amounts to this—that there are vouchers there for the whole amount of it, but that they have not been yet put on file, and put the other end up, as they will have to be before they are filed away. [Laughter.]

Now, sir, there are vouchers for all. And as to the rest of this money—\$140,000—it is of no importance so far as this question is concerned, for he never had a dollar of it in his possession. And yet the committee undertake to say that he had. A reference to it is found on page 66 of the report, and I wish the attention of gentlemen who are interested in the matter. The committee say:

"After Mr. Cummings had concluded his testimony and taken the same for revision, he added the following note:

"I have retained, under the authority of the Secretary of the Treasury, by Messrs. Dix, Blatchford, and Opdyke, \$140,000, besides what I have stated in my testimony, which is accounted for by the vouchers."

They made his note read, "I have retained." Now, I will read a few words to show how this committee understood that:

"Still we are informed by this note"—

after having spoken of the disposition of the remainder—

"that Mr. Cummings has retained \$140,000 of the money over and above that stated in his testimony, (\$250,000,) 'which is accounted for by the vouchers.' This item seems to have been overlooked by him in his testimony. One hundred and forty thousand dollars is in his hands

over and above the \$160,000 for which he has filed vouchers in the War Department," &c.

And then they go on to censure the Secretary of War for not having called sooner for the vouchers for the \$140,000, the other having been accounted for. Now, it turns out that Cummings never wrote such a note. He wrote them a note informing them that "there had been retained, under authority of the Secretary of the Treasury, by Messrs. Dix, Blatchford, and Opdyke," in whose hands, you will remember, the whole was deposited, and drawn out as needed, "\$140,000, besides what I have stated in my testimony, which is accounted for by the vouchers."

Mr. DAWES. Accounted for by the vouchers?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes, sir; the vouchers; and beyond that they say there were \$140,000 in his hands. And then they go on to say that it was in his hands, and what a crime it was. Thus, it being a fraudulent transaction, and not having for four months accounted for it, they draw the inference that the Secretary of War should be censured.

Now, as I said before, I want you to look at the original note. It does not say, "I have retained under authority," &c., but "there retained under the authority," &c. Now, when the original was found, admitting that there was a mistake in this, the committee say it was the mistake of the printer—these printers' mistakes are very convenient things—and that it should have read, "there retained." Now, Mr. Speaker, recollect that whoever made the mistake, the printer did not write the report charging Cummings with having \$140,000 in his hands. The printer did not say that Mr. Cummings said so. That was written by the committee; when, I do not know. It was before the report was printed that the thing was written; for when this thing was first up before the House the testimony was not printed. It was not before the House, nor for some weeks afterwards; and the gentleman from Massachusetts alone [Mr. DAWES] had what he said were the proof sheets, from which he sometimes enlightened us with what was behind, but which we had not seen. Now, how do the committee account for their writing a report upon the mistake of the printer? I suppose the report was written before it was furnished to the printer.

Mr. WASHBURN. I will state to the gentleman that the evidence and report were printed together.

Mr. STEVENS. Then, if the evidence and report were printed together, the report was founded upon a falsehood, and all printed together.

Mr. DAWES. If the gentleman will allow me—

Mr. STEVENS. I do not want any other explanation. This suits me exactly. [Laughter.] I will excuse the gentleman.



Mr. DAWES. Does the gentleman decline to have me interrupt him and tell him just how it is?

Mr. STEVENS. I have not declined to hear any gentleman's explanation, though these explanations are a little annoying.

Mr. DAWES. I do not think my colleague [Mr. WASHBURN] designed to say that the report was written before the evidence was printed.

Mr. STEVENS. That is what he did say.

Mr. WASHBURN. I said, or intended to say, that the report and evidence were presented together.

Mr. STEVENS. "Printed" was the word. These *lapsus lingue* and *lapsus penne*, &c., are bad things. [Laughter.]

Mr. DAWES. I suppose the gentleman from Pennsylvania desires to have it right. I do not know.

Mr. STEVENS. Undoubtedly.

Mr. DAWES. I told the gentleman from Pennsylvania the other day—what every member of the House will bear me out in saying—that no member of the committee ever saw that writing until the day before I brought it into the House; that it was handed to the clerk of the committee by Mr. Cummings, by the clerk taken to the printing office, by the printer set up, by the printer read in proof, and after it was set up and in the proof, it was handed to us in print, and not a member of the committee ever saw the original note until the day before I brought it into the House here, more than three months after the report had been made.

Mr. STEVENS. How did it get into the printer's hands?

Mr. DAWES. Does the gentleman forget how I told him it got there? I told you a moment ago that Mr. Cummings handed it to the clerk, that the clerk of the committee took it to the printer, and that not a member of the committee ever saw it until three months after the printed report appeared here in the House. I hope the gentleman will not forget it.

Mr. STEVENS. I have not forgotten it.

Mr. DAWES. Then you are to blame for the mistake.

Mr. STEVENS. Perhaps I may be; but I have a letter here from Mr. Defrees, the Superintendent of Public Printing, who states that as he printed this matter he sent a copy of each proof-sheet to each member of the committee.

Mr. DAWES. Certainly.

Mr. STEVENS. Now, it will hardly do to say that they did not see the proof; and when it was taken, it seems to me they ought to have looked at it. The committee that takes testimony, that has it printed, that reads the proof, are responsible for it, especially if they found upon it a grave charge against the integrity of an upright citizen, and charge him with embezzlement. And I may be allowed to say that the statement of the gentleman from Massachu-

setts makes the matter no better. There is a principle in law which he well knows, that when a man rashly, and without taking the proper means to ascertain the facts, swears to a fact material to the issue, and it turns out to be false, although he did not know it to be false, although he supposed it to be true, yet, as he has rashly sworn to a fact which he did not know to be true, he is guilty of perjury, and deserves the penitentiary. Such is the law of the country, and such is its application to this report. A committee, having every opportunity of knowing the facts, makes a report to the country, damning the character of a man, so far as their damnation will go, and have no other excuse than saying it was a mistake of the printer. I say it is their fault, and they are just as much answerable for it as if they had wilfully forged it, and written "I have," instead of "there was retained;" and the sense of justice of the community will hold them responsible before the world, as the law holds them responsible in a legal point of view. This is fraudulent representation No. 1.

Let me come to No. 2. That is the celebrated case of Augustus A. Sacchi. The committee say that General Fremont found a man in New York by the name of Sacchi, and that he went out West—

Mr. WASHBURN. Will the gentleman be good enough to read that part of the report in which the committee say that?

Mr. STEVENS. Well, then, that a man from New York found Fremont. [Laughter.] I think the testimony shows that a man by the name of Sacchi, from New York, went to St. Louis, if I recollect the evidence aright, under directions from General Fremont, and entered into a contract with an aid of General Fremont by the name of Wood, for a certain number of Canadian horses. After he had made that contract, he went off and never complied with it; he did not live up to the contract. The contract, the committee say, was made in defiance of all propriety, because they ought to have bought the horses in the western country; and yet they contracted with this man Sacchi, who failed to comply with the contract. They do not say that he ever received any of the money. I believe the contrary appears even in their own book, if I understand it correctly. They then go on to censure it as having been a fraudulent transaction, made under the direction of General Fremont. They show what a fraudulent contract it was, made with a man of the name of Sacchi. They did not care anything about Sacchi, who, they say, lived in a garret in New York, or Captain Turnley said so. They were fishing for larger fish than that. The gentleman says that I said they devoted several pages of this report to this matter. I was wrong. It is only three pages, and not several. But they gravely wind up with this significant phrase:

"It will hardly to be believed that the name

' of this same man, Sacchi, appears in the newspapers as being on the staff of General Fremont at Springfield, with the rank of captain."

Well now, if the gentlemen meant that literally, they are right, for nobody would believe it because it is found in their report. [Laughter.] But if they meant, as I suppose they did, that nobody, without their veracious report, would believe that this man, with whom a fraudulent contract had been entered into through Fremont's agent, was a member of Fremont's staff, it turns out that there is not a word of truth in it. This man Sacchi, who made the contract, was a resident of New York, an old man between sixty and seventy, who had lived there a great many years, and the Mr. Sacchi on Fremont's staff was a young gentleman from Europe, who never heard anything about this contract.

Mr. WASHBURNE. Will the gentleman enlighten the House as to where he gets his facts?

Mr. STEVENS. I have seen an affidavit made by the genuine horse dealer, Sacchi.

Mr. WASHBURNE. *Ex parte*?

Mr. STEVENS. Yes; and therefore I suppose the gentleman has a right to deny it if he will. It is not much better in that respect than this book. [Laughter]

Mr. WASHBURNE. I suppose the gentleman will admit that the book is quite as good.

Mr. STEVENS. Well, I do not suppose it is pretended now that this man Sacchi, on Fremont's staff, is the man who is implicated by this report. Even the gentleman from Massachusetts did not assert that, and I am sure my friend on the right will not.

Mr. WASHBURNE. It is a matter I know nothing about. I do not know whether he came here "to crusade for freedom in freedom's holy land" or not. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEVENS. I do not think he did know anything about it; and yet the committee report the fact solemnly to the country, and base upon it this charge against Fremont. Why, I do not believe they knew more about this than they did about two-thirds of the other things they have put in this report. [Laughter.] Now, sir, they ought to have known whether they did or not. There is a mistake, whether you call it fraudulent or not.

Mr. WASHBURNE. The gentleman seems to think that this is an attack upon his friend, and my friend, Fremont—because we fought the battle together in 1856. Will he be good enough to read, not three lines, but four lines and a half, at the top of the 94th page of the report?

Mr. STEVENS. Oh, I have read it, sir.

Mr. WASHBURNE. Will my friend be good enough to read it to the House?

Mr. STEVENS. Oh, no; I do not care to do that.

Mr. WASHBURNE. I wish you would.

Mr. STEVENS. I can tell the House what it is, though. It is taking him by the beard and saying, "art thou in health, my brother?" [Much laughter.] They ought to have known the facts, if they did not, before they charged that this fraudulent contract had been made with a member of Fremont's staff.

Mr. WASHBURNE. Does the gentleman say that the contract was a proper one? Has he any fault to find with the committee for exposing the contract?

Mr. STEVENS. The contract is not brought here in the resolution. If it was, I would vote that the Mr. Sacchi who made the horse contract should not get a dollar more money.

Mr. WASHBURNE. If he had an honest contract, why did he not ask for the money due him?

Mr. STEVENS. Because he did not furnish the horses. [Laughter.] Because Fremont, having limited the time, revoked the contract when it expired, and would not let him go on and furnish the horses.

Mr. WASHBURNE. The gentleman has certainly read the report, and he must have seen that Sacchi did deliver a certain number of horses, for which six or seven thousand dollars was due him. If it was a perfectly honest transaction, why did not he appear and claim the payment of that amount?

Mr. STEVENS. I do not say that it was an honest transaction; and if the committee had set upon old Sacchi about it, I should not have objected. The whole significance of it is in the question—a little jesuitical, perhaps, but it shows the ingenuity of the gentleman—"who would believe that this same Sacchi, who had thus made this contract with Fremont, or under his orders, was one of his own staff?"

Mr. WASHBURNE. You say you would not believe it.

Mr. STEVENS. I would not have believed it unless I had known it. I would not have believed that Fremont would have made a contract with one of his own staff in that way, and I do not believe it yet, although the gentleman did assert it in that interrogative way.

Having got through with what I had to say about number two, I come now to number three, upon which this resolution is founded, and my friend from Massachusetts has discovered that it is that particular item which has interested me in this matter—I mean the contract with one Simon Stevens for Hall's carbines, page 40 of the report. The gentleman from Massachusetts, with that perfect ingenuousness which is the index of his character, in attempting to account for my defending some of these gentlemen against this report, and not being able to conceive of a higher motive than interest or connection, with a great flourish of trumpets informed this House that they, perhaps, did not know what it was that produced the disapprobation of the chairman of the Committee of Ways and Means, but he would state

to them what it was; that the committee encountered from him no opposition until they had touched a contract in which one Simon Stevens was interested.

Now, I ask the House what the public would infer, and what the gentleman intended that this House should infer, from that statement? Why, that because this man happens to be of the same name, he is some connection or some family relative of mine. If he did not mean that, then it was a most unmeaning flourish of trumpets. Now, sir, at this point I will say that Simon Stevens is in no way, even in the most remote degree, any kindred of mine. The gentleman would not tell the public that, nor have them believe it, I suppose, from his remarks. I do not say this for the purpose of casting any reflection upon Simon Stevens. He is a constituent of mine. I knew his father when I was very young, in Vermont. He is still living, and as intelligent and honorable a man as that noble State has ever produced. His son came to Pennsylvania to seek his fortune long after I came there; not to the same county, but I went to the county where he resided. His character, where he is known, stands as fair as that of any member of this House—except the committee. [Laughter.] He has never been charged or impeached with fraud until now by this committee.

Mr. DAWES. Where was he educated?

Mr. STEVENS. In Vermont.

Mr. DAWES. Where did he study law?

Mr. STEVENS. He read law with me, and hence I speak of him with the more confidence as being a man of unimpeachable character. [Laughter.] And unless by these insinuations, which anywhere else would be despised, the gentleman can say naught to the contrary. Whatever I may be, he is a gentleman of high character and standing.

But it is said that until I found he was attacked, the committee encountered no opposition from me. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts see in what an awkward place he puts himself? I never knew that Mr. Stevens was attacked, nor did anybody else to my knowledge, till the report of the committee was published. How could I make any opposition to any part of its proceedings until I knew what those proceedings were? The first I ever heard of the charge was when the book was first published.

Mr. DAWES. Then I think that great injustice has been done to the gentleman by this same Simon Stevens.

Mr. STEVENS. If there is anything in the record the gentleman may state it, but if the gentleman is going to give parole evidence I must object. We have had enough of that already.

Mr. DAWES. I was only going to tell the gentleman—

Mr. STEVENS. You need not tell me. I

do not want to hear anything except what is in the record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania declines to yield.

Mr. DAWES. I see he does.

Mr. STEVENS. So much for the insinuations of the gentleman as to motive. Now, what were the facts? You will remember, from the report all the way through, that the committee undertook to infer that Simon Stevens bought and sold these guns not for himself, but that it was a purchase of General Fremont's through Simon Stevens. The adoption of the resolution would censure General Fremont by charging him with attempting to get for these carbines ten dollars each more than they cost, and with buying them for the Government through an agent. Hence it was that I humbly submitted to the Chair that this was a resolution of censure on General Fremont, and that therefore I had a right to offer my resolution as an amendment. Now, did not the gentleman know that was not true? Had he not direct evidence that that contract was made by Simon Stevens, not for General Fremont, but for himself? The committee called Simon Stevens before it, and asked him that question. He was asked whether he bought these arms and sold them for himself, or on account of General Fremont; and he distinctly swore that nobody having anything to do with the Government had anything to do with his purchase or sale of those arms. He was asked:

"Were you acting during any of the time you mention as an agent of the Government?"

And his answer is:

"I was not in any manner whatever."

Now, sir, having some evidence that Mr. Simon Stevens had sent some guns to General Fremont by express, the committee reasoned from that that General Fremont purchased these arms, through him, for the Government, and afterwards sold them for his own profit. General Fremont would not go voluntarily before the committee, but he professed his readiness to go if summoned. The committee was often invited to subpoena him, but did not do it, although he was several weeks in this city. A member of this House [Mr. SEDGWICK] addressed him a letter which, with General Fremont's reply, I ask to have read—

[Here the hammer fell.]

Several MEMBERS. Let the gentleman from Pennsylvania conclude his remarks.

Mr. WASHBURN. I will not object to that; but I am very sorry that the same courtesy could not have been yielded to my colleague on the committee [Mr. DAWES] when he desired to make an explanation.

The SPEAKER. Is there any objection?

Mr. WASHBURN. I do not object, although my colleague was very abruptly cut off the other day.

Mr. STEVENS. Not by me.

Mr. WASHBURN. I am proud to say, sir, that it was not by you. You would never have done such a thing.

The following documents were read :

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
WASHINGTON CITY, February 20, 1862.

SIR: I desire to have a statement from you, in writing, for the use of the House of Representatives, as to whether you purchased the five thousand Hall's carbines alluded to in the report of the committee to investigate Government contracts, of which Mr. VAN WYCK is chairman, from Simon Stevens, or through him; and whether at any time Mr. Stevens was acting for you in the purchase or forwarding of ordnance stores to St. Louis during the time you were in command of the western department.

I have the honor to be, very truly, your obedient servant,  
C. B. SEDGWICK.

Major General J. C. FREMONT, U. S. Army.

WASHINGTON, February 22, 1862.

SIR: In reply to your note of inquiry, dated 20th instant and received to-day, I have to say that the Hall's carbines, concerning which question is made, were purchased by me directly from Mr. Stevens, and not through him, agreeably to the offer of sale received from him by telegram. Subsequently—about the 18th of August—Mr. Stevens was appointed to a post on my staff, and instructed by me to occupy himself as might be directed in procuring and forwarding arms and stores from New York and consignments to me from Europe on account of the United States. In this capacity he continued to act until about the 26th September.

With respect, yours truly, J. C. FREMONT.  
Hon. C. B. SEDGWICK, House of Representatives.

Mr. STEVENS. Now, Mr. Speaker, we have the positive testimony of Simon Stevens that in this matter he acted for himself, and not as an agent, and we have also the express declaration of General Fremont that he bought these arms directly from Simon Stevens, and not through him. And yet this resolution is so framed as to assert—and the committee, in its report, undertakes to assert—that General Fremont must have bought them through an agent, and that Simon Stevens was the agent for the purpose. I ask, therefore, whether I characterized this report too harshly when it asks you to believe this, and when it declares that Simon Stevens is a perjured man, without having called a witness to impeach him? That is not the sort of justice which the citizens of this country expect from committees of Congress. It is not the kind of inference by which men's characters are to be destroyed. As I said before, this effort, insidious as it is, jesuitically drawn as it is, is an effort to charge General Fremont with purchasing these arms for the Government, through Simon Stevens, making it his transaction and his gain, instead the transaction and gain of Stevens; and that is the proposition which this House is called upon to affirm. Now, I have a right to say that such a

report as that is wholly false and unworthy of credit, for I have proved it to be so. The House must say so. If Simon Stevens purchased these arms from the owner at a cheap rate, had them altered, and then sold them back, it was a speculation which may not be very pleasant to look at; but it was a legitimate business transaction, and involves no officer of the Government. If any officers of the Government were involved, they were those who sold the arms at \$3 50 each. Simon Stevens purchased them for \$12 50, and after having them rifled and breeched, he sold them to General Fremont at \$22. General Fremont states, in his testimony, that they are good arms, and that they are now in use in the western department.

Mr. SHANKS. They are in use in General Halleck's army, and did good service at the battle of Pea Ridge.

Mr. DAWES. I ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania to turn his attention to the testimony of Captain Callender, of the St. Louis arsenal.

Mr. STEVENS. I believe the gentleman from Indiana, [Mr. SHANKS,] and General Fremont, as quickly as I would Captain Callender, or any other cullender that may be brought up. It is amazing with what tenacity my friend from Massachusetts will insist on fixing fraudulent conduct on citizens who have not offended him, interlarding, very often, his own testimony to bring out the testimony of others. It is accounted for in a measure by his habits and training as a prosecuting officer. We often acquire habits in this way which we cannot get rid of. I do not think this quality natural to my friend. He says that we have abused this report, and characterized it as a lying report. I was speaking of the effect of the instrument, and did not desire to be understood as implying falsehood on the part of the committee. I propose to call a living witness to prove that fact, because I stand by what I say, and will prove it if I can; if I cannot, I will retract it.

General Fremont, in his sworn testimony before the joint committee on the conduct of the war, uses this language in reference to the opportunity afforded him by the committee of the House of being heard:

"And while examining into the conduct and events of the war, I think it right to call the attention of your committee to the fact that a committee charged to 'investigate frauds' came into a department which was under martial law, in the midst of civil dissensions encouraging insubordination, discrediting and weakening the authority of the commanding general, then absent in the field, and I offer testimony to show that their conduct while at St. Louis created a public opinion that their special object was to make out a case against myself which should justify my removal from that department. (See page 79 of that report.) And I offer testimony to show that they avoided and declined to receive, and have suppressed, testi-

'mony which militated against this object, and further to show that there are in the report many 'inaccuracies and perversions and some positive 'falsehoods.'

Who impeaches that witness?

Mr. DAWES. Perhaps the gentleman did not observe, as he was absent a portion of the time on Friday, that I asked the committee on the conduct of the war whether General Fremont had furnished any further evidence upon that point.

Mr. STEVENS. One member of that committee.

Mr. DAWES. I asked the committee on the conduct of the war that question.

Mr. STEVENS. I heard the gentleman ask the gentleman from New York, [Mr. ODELL,] who is a member of that committee, and he responded.

Dr. DAWES. My question was addressed to the committee, several members of which I saw present; and I then remarked that I would call on the gentleman from New York for an answer. In the presence of the committee, he replied that General Fremont had not furnished any evidence to sustain the charges made by him, except his own statement.

Mr. STEVENS. I recollect the question of the gentleman, and my recollection is that the gentleman from New York stated that he did not know that there was any evidence before them upon this point, except General Fremont's. I think that was the answer. Now, I do not say that that evidence has been taken, but I would ask the gentleman from Indiana on my right, [Mr. JULIAN,] who is a member of that committee, whether General Fremont has furnished them with the names of witnesses which he still desires to have them examine?

Mr. JULIAN. I will state, in answer to the question, that General Fremont did furnish us with a list of witnesses whom he desired us to call, by whom he told us he could prove every material fact which he asserted upon his own responsibility. The committee, however, at that time only sent for such witnesses as in their judgment were necessary to clear up matters left in doubt, and settle the substantial merits of the case as they then understood it. I ought, perhaps, further to state that both General Fremont and those who have assailed him have since insisted upon further testimony upon one side and upon the other, and that I believe some further examination will be made of other witnesses upon these matters by the committee on the conduct of the war.

Mr. DAWES. Perhaps the gentleman from Indiana will either corroborate or deny the statement made by his colleague on the committee on the conduct of the war?

Mr. STEVENS. Oh! there is no dispute about that.

Mr. JULIAN. I think the statement made by my colleague was correct, although I did not

understand it precisely as the gentleman from Massachusetts states it.

Mr. DAWES. Will the gentleman allow me to ask the gentleman from New York whether I did not state his answer to my question correctly?

Mr. ODELL. The gentleman stated my answer, as I recollect it.

Mr. STEVENS. I have not called in question the accuracy of the statement at all. I think it was correct. But I was going to ask the gentleman from Indiana whether he did not, at the request of General Fremont, furnish to the committee on the conduct of the war the names of witnesses who General Fremont supposed would prove the facts I have suggested.

Mr. SHANKS. I did furnish to one member of the committee some names which General Fremont handed to me, who, he told me, could prove the facts suggested by the gentleman from Pennsylvania, among a good many others, which I could mention, but I suppose it is unnecessary.

Mr. GOOCH. I desire to ask the gentleman from Indiana whether he furnished to any member of the committee on the conduct of the war the names of any witnesses who he said could prove those charges against the committee on Government contracts?

Mr. SHANKS. I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts did not understand, when I said that General Fremont furnished me with a list of witnesses and stated what they could prove, that I prescribed to the committee what questions they should ask them.

Mr. GOOCH. Was there any communication to the committee as to what testimony these witnesses would give?

Mr. SHANKS. Certainly not.

Mr. GOOCH. I desire to state, in behalf of that committee, that we have been desired to take the testimony of a cloud of witnesses to prove various points; but as these witnesses were, many of them, in Missouri, and others at other distant points, the committee have found it impracticable to bring before them the persons whose names have been suggested. At the same time, so far as this matter is concerned, if the House desire to spend the money of the Government in that way, we are willing to send for and examine all those gentlemen.

Mr. WASHBURN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania has read an extract from General Fremont's testimony in which he says the committee on Government contracts have declined to receive testimony and have suppressed testimony. I desire to say that the committee did not decline to take testimony or suppress testimony. And any assertion of that kind by General Fremont, or anybody else, is utterly untrue.

Mr. STEVENS. It may all be so. I have very often heard them plead "not guilty" before. [Laughter.] But, sir, I am not using

my own assertion; I am not using my own perversion of testimony; I am reading sworn evidence.

Mr. WASHBURNE. Does the gentleman call that evidence, when General Fremont, who gives it, preposes to prove the truth of his assertions by witnesses which he does not call?

Mr. STEVENS. He did call them, but they have not come.

Mr. WASHBURNE. And they never will come.

Mr. STEVENS. They will come, I suppose, if the committee send for them; but I do not intend to cast any reflection upon the committee on the conduct of the war for not sending for them.

Mr. WASHBURNE. The gentleman has referred to the example, as he calls it, of the committee on the conduct of the war in giving notice to the party accused. Did that committee give this committee of the House notice that they were accused of falsehood and the suppression of testimony?

Mr. STEVENS. I do not know. I do not belong to that committee. If they have not given it, they ought to. That is all I have to say. The gentleman from Illinois does not, of course, understand me as intending to make any reflections upon him.

Mr. WASHBURNE. Certainly not. The gentleman has too much amiability for that.

Mr. GOOCH. The committee on the conduct of the war have not found it necessary to give any such notice. The publication of the testimony of General Fremont was a sufficient notice.

Mr. WASHBURNE. By the order of the committee?

Mr. GOOCH. No, sir.

Mr. WASHBURNE. By whose order?

Mr. GOOCH. General Fremont, I suppose, had it published:

Mr. WASHBURNE. How did he obtain possession of the evidence?

Mr. GOOCH. I suppose he retained a copy.

Mr. COLFAX. Can the gentleman from Illinois inform the House how a telegraphic summary of the testimony taken before his committee in St. Louis, while General Fremont was in the field in the face of the enemy, came to be sent to New York and published in the New York papers?

Mr. WASHBURNE. No, sir; I do not know anything about it. Does the gentleman from Indiana know?

Mr. COLFAX. No, sir; I do not.

Mr. WASHBURNE. Then why does the gentleman bring it in here at this time?

Mr. COLFAX. Because it was a fact that while the committee on Government contracts were in St. Louis, an abstract of their report was sent to the New York papers; very much to the detriment of General Fremont and the military operations of his department, while he was chasing the enemy in a distant part of the

State. They went through the State of Missouri and took testimony behind his back. They sat in secret session with closed doors, and yet an abstract of that *ex parte* testimony was put upon the telegraph wires and spread all over the country. That abstract of testimony could have only been obtained in one way.

Mr. WASHBURNE. There was no abstract so published.

Mr. COLFAX. It must have been published by the consent of the committee.

Mr. STEVENS. It must have merely been "a mistake of the printer." [Laughter.] Now, sir, this House called for that testimony by a large majority.

Mr. WASHBURNE. What was that resolution?

Mr. STEVENS. To furnish the testimony, if it were deemed compatible with the public interest.

Mr. WASHBURNE. Did the House order General Fremont to publish it without the consent of the committee?

Mr. STEVENS. Neither did the Adjutant General ask the consent of Congress to publish his charges. Perhaps we ought to have consulted him about it.

Mr. COLFAX. The committee are aware and the House are aware that the charges of the committee and of the communication of General Thomas were spread all over this land against General Fremont, and it was not deemed incompatible with the public interest. That was considered all right and proper; but when General Fremont's defence is made public, we hear the allegation that it was not compatible with the public interest. When these charges were made against him, and disseminated throughout the country for effect upon the public mind, he could not believe that it was not right and proper to give his reply to the public.

Mr. STEVENS. I am sorry that General Fremont made the mistake of not consulting Adjutant General Thomas. He had been attacked by the Adjutant General for three months, and he had been attacked by this special committee, and he had gone before the world on their reports without one word in his behalf. Then he was weak enough to dare, through the publication of his testimony, to let the public know that he was not guilty. Without being a member of General Fremont's staff, although there is a man upon it of my name, I take upon myself the responsibility of apologizing for General Fremont's mistake. [Laughter.]

Now, sir, a word about a personal matter, which has been given much publicity by the eloquence of the gentleman from Massachusetts, [Mr. DAWES.] He denounced me with once having been on unfriendly terms with General Cameron, and with now being in social intimacy with him. As I have said already, I have not introduced the name of General Cameron in this debate. It is unpleasant to



go into one's biography. It is true, as the gentleman has said, before the appointment of General Cameron to a place in the Cabinet of Mr. Lincoln, I, together with eight or ten others of my colleagues, waited on Mr. Lincoln and protested against his appointment as a member of the Cabinet. We did not think that he was the proper person to go there, nor did we think that he had the capacity. We gave other strong reasons why he should not be appointed. It is true that those reasons did not appear very strong, for the executive power treated them as I expect they deserved to be treated, with silent contempt. General Cameron was appointed a member of Mr. Lincoln's Cabinet. There was no reason why, if he spoke to me, I should not speak to him. He had done me no harm, but he took it into his head that it was offensive for me to go with others to the President to protest against his appointment as a Cabinet officer, as no doubt it was. He cut my acquaintance, and we had no further intercourse until I came here to Congress in last July.

In the mean time General Cameron was a Cabinet officer, and I made up my mind, as a Christian, I suppose, to forget what I had said about him, and to judge him by his official conduct. I intended that my judgment of him should be controlled by his official conduct. I was somewhat surprised that he took the same view of conducting and ending this war that I did. I know that there was a difference of opinion whether he was right or wrong. I thought that he was right. I thought he was better upon that ground than any other member of the President's Cabinet. I had ascertained, not through him, but through others, that he had written instructions to General Sherman, from Cincinnati, which had been materially altered before they reached him. He was in favor of employing fugitives from labor or service in the service of the United States; but there was added by another hand "this, however, was not to be a general arming of them for military service." He wrote "you will assure all loyal masters that Congress will provide just compensation to them for the loss of the services of the persons so employed. You will assure all persons held to involuntary labor who may be thus received into the service of the Government, that they will, under no circumstances, be again reduced to their former condition, unless at the expiration of their respective terms of service they freely choose to return to the service of their former masters." The latter was in the original, but it was all stricken out. The people know how his report was emasculated. I felt that he was right, and I said here, and I said everywhere, that I would support him so long as he pursued that course. After I had said that publicly, General Cameron waited on me. He came, he said, to renew our acquaintance. He said that he saw I was supporting him, and as we had to act together he desired

to be on terms of personal intercourse. I replied that I had not the slightest objection. I told him that I would support him so long as he followed out the course which he had started. I told him further, that I would look upon his past record as a blank sheet, and that I would judge him by his official conduct as a Cabinet officer. That is how General Cameron and I came to speak.

The gentleman who has alluded to this personal matter has seen no indelicacy, either, in referring to private hospitalities in this city. He said that I was found at General Cameron's table, with others, and that there all of these differences were reconciled through four horse contracts, yielding a profit of some four hundred thousand dollars. I do not know whether any slander is attempted to be insinuated against me. He said my colleagues were there, and that these contracts settled all political differences, and that we went before the President upon our knees and begged to withdraw our protest against General Cameron. I would like to know upon what authority the gentleman makes that declaration. Neither my colleagues nor myself ever withdrew any protest which we had made to the President, nor did we ever attempt to apologize for it. Yet the gentleman would make the public believe that because of these horse contracts, some of my colleagues withdrew the protest which they had made against the appointment of General Cameron to a Cabinet appointment. I regret that the gentleman should have deemed it necessary to give currency to this slander. After the time referred to, I was invited to dine with General Cameron, in company with the Governor and chief justice of Pennsylvania. I could see no good reason why I should not. I went there; I did not find one of my colleagues who had protested to the President against the appointment of General Cameron. I met there some thirty persons, whom I did not feel very much ashamed to have met, though if the insinuations of the gentleman were true, I ought to have been ashamed. I met there the Governor and chief justice of Pennsylvania, several officers of the army, and most of the Cabinet; and the Commander-in-Chief of the armies and navies of the United States was also present at that polluted and polluting feast, which the gentleman from Massachusetts has twice dragged before the public.

Mr. DAWES. The gentleman has probably inadvertently fallen into two mistakes: the first is that I asserted, here or elsewhere, that any of his colleagues were there with him; and secondly, that I have brought out here twice this matter of the feast. It was a telegram from this city, contained in the public papers, and it was considered of sufficient importance to state that the distinguished gentleman from Pennsylvania was there, and that the purpose of the feast was precisely what I stated to the House. I did not say it in any such connection as the

gentleman has used it. Nor have I ever put the matter of the feast in connection with the fact that the men who protested against the appointment of Mr. Cameron afterwards went up and—

Mr. STEVENS. I understood the gentleman to say, in connection with that feast, that old political feuds and horse contracts were there settled.

Mr. DAWES. I do not qualify that. I repeat it and stand by it.

Mr. STEVENS. That the gentleman repeats but gives no evidence of it. He is in the habit of asserting things of which there is no evidence and no foundation in fact.

But, sir, the gentleman stated another thing. He stated that after I had stated what I did and made my attack upon their report on the Monday when the committee were absent, he accounted for it by saying that that gentleman—I understood him to refer to an ex-Cabinet minister—was in this Hall and came to my seat and immediately congratulated me upon the success of my achievement. I would be glad if the gentleman would tell me the source of his information.

Mr. DAWES. I would be glad to have the gentleman state whether Mr. Cameron did not appear at his seat on Wednesday last and take him by the hand and congratulate him upon the matter which transpired on Monday.

Mr. STEVENS. I say he did not. Now, I ask for the authority.

Mr. DAWES. He appeared at your seat on Wednesday?

Mr. STEVENS. Mr. Cameron was not here on Monday that I know of.

Mr. DAWES. That was not my interrogatory.

Mr. STEVENS. Let me finish my answer. On Wednesday Mr. Cameron called here and asked me when he could have an interview with me; and I believe that is all he said. He did not then, nor has he since mentioned to me my speech, or its effect.

Mr. DAWES. The gentleman, if he has read my remarks, will understand that I said that I did not have the privilege of being present when he attacked me and my associates, but that I was informed that subsequently to this attack, General Cameron appeared at his seat and congratulated him. I state now that I was so informed. The gentleman says that General Cameron did appear at his seat just when I say he did, that he did take him by the hand just when I say he did, and did ask him when he might have a private interview with him. What else he said I do not know, and I do not care.

Mr. STEVENS. I have not time to turn to the gentleman's speech, but it strikes me that the gentleman connected General Cameron's presence in this Hall with my speech on that same day.

Mr. DAWES. I state further that I did sup-

pose that he was here on Monday, for I understood a gentleman to tell me distinctly that General Cameron was here on Monday, and with the gentleman he mentioned. I know he was here on Wednesday, and that was the time to which I referred, when he appeared at the gentleman's seat and congratulated him upon his achievement.

Mr. STEVENS. I have now the gentleman's speech before me. He says:

"Sir, I am not permitted to overlook also the connection of others in this matter. Although I had not the privilege of being present during the fore part of this week, when this scene transpired, I am informed that a distinguished ex-functionary of the Government was here in this House as the generalissimo on that occasion. I am informed that subsequently he appeared at the seat of the distinguished member from Pennsylvania, [Mr. STEVENS,] and congratulated him on the signal success of his achievement over the committee."

Mr. DAWES. I was so informed.

Mr. STEVENS. Will the gentleman allow us to know who informed him?

Mr. DAWES. Does the gentleman want a private conversation?

Mr. STEVENS. Why was it made use of in this House, if it was a private conversation?

Mr. DAWES. The gentleman, in undertaking to defend General Fremont from an attack made behind his back, thinks it justifiable to attack somebody else behind his back; and the person attacked behind his back was compelled to get the information as to the manner in which the attack was made from those who knew about it.

Mr. STEVENS. I do not object to that; but I want to know who gave such information.

Mr. DAWES. I have not myself the slightest objection to informing the gentleman; but I do not suppose the gentlemen who gave me the information desire to have their names involved, and themselves exposed to the scarification of the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. STEVENS. I shall not scarify the gentleman, if I know what that word means. [Laughter.] The gentleman awhile ago said that he was informed that Alexander Cummings, when he was so sick that he was not expected to recover, said that if he got well he would confess his sins and make a clean breast of it.

Mr. DAWES. I repeat it now, and I have the good fortune to know that it does not depend upon my recollection alone.

Mr. STEVENS. And the gentleman will not give the name of his informer when he is asked for it.

Mr. DAWES. When a man charges me with lying he must take what he gets in return, and should not expect me to give him any sort of explanation until he retracts what he has said.



Mr. STEVENS. To whom does the gentleman refer?

Mr. DAWES. I refer to the man who complains that I will not give the name of my informer.

Mr. STEVENS. Several have made that complaint.

Mr. DAWES. Having charged me with lying, upon this floor, merely because the printer makes a mistake, when I attempt to reply he goes around whining, and wants me to give the name of my informer. I told him distinctly that no man who made such a charge against me could hold any correspondence with me. I refer not to the gentleman who is now speaking; but to the man whom he is trying to defend by a very small hole in the indictment.

Mr. STEVENS. I must leave this matter, as the gentleman will not say from whom he derived his information. I have detained the House too long upon a mere personal matter.

I am willing to believe that the members of the committee are actuated by the purest motives in this investigation. I cannot believe that it is an innate love of scandal which induces them to their course. They must have some higher motive. I can hardly believe that they should rejoice or take any pleasure in feeding upon the mangled carcasses of the reputations of their fellow-citizens, for that would be ranking them with the furies of the French Revolution, who attended the scaffolds, who dipped their handkerchiefs in human gore, and gobbled up the garbage which lay around the foot of the guillotine.

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 013 701 726 A